

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-13, and 15-23 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 3-11, and 17-23 have been allowed. Claims 12, 15, and 16 stand rejected. Claim 13 is objected to.

The Examiner is thanked for the allowance of claims 1, 3-11, and 17-23. However, Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection of claims 12, 15, and 16.

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 12 and 15-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wasserman (U.S. Patent No. 5,260,779) in view of Magro (U.S. Patent No. 6,260,081).

The Examiner states, in part:

Regarding lines 7-10 on page 8 of applicant's remarks, applicant contends that Magro does not teach that "peripherals such as cameras and other devices can be accessed by connecting to a DMA controller through plural DMA channels". The examiner respectfully disagrees. In Magro's fig. 2 and col. 4, ln. 61 to col. 5, ln. 65, Magro suggests that peripherals can be accessed by connecting to a DMA controller to plural DMA channels, and that peripherals is a term that imply a variety of periphery devices that can include cameras. There peripheral devices, ie. cameras, can be commonly connected to a DMA controller for properly accessing multiple cameras, and that each camera can be connected to a DMA channel.

(Emphasis added.)

Applicants respectfully disagree. First, the cited portions of Magro do not teach or suggest that "peripherals" can be accessed by connecting a DMA controller to plural DMA channels. Magro describes the connection of a single peripheral device 216. The Examiner has failed to identify where Magro suggests the connection of multiple peripherals via multiple DMA channels.

In addition, Magro does not teach or suggest the use of a camera as the single peripheral device 216. Indeed, Applicants are unable to locate any reference in Magro to cameras. Magro describes, in part:

Peripheral devices which commonly use DMA channels include DRAM (dynamic random access memory) refresh circuitry, sound cards, SCSI host adapters, parallel ports, tape cards, network cards, modems, and floppy disk controllers. (Col. 2, lines 28-32.)

For at least these reasons, the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness of claims 12 and 15-16.

As previously indicated, the combination of claimed elements can provide advantages not appreciated by the cited references. In particular, the specification describes some benefits that may be obtained with some embodiments of the present invention:

This arrangement provides a significant advantage over conventional systems that read image data from local memories on framegrabber boards, i.e., non-direct access. In this prior art approach, image data gets overwritten or flushed as soon as the camera transmits another frame. This image data must then be later re-acquired by sending the camera back to the point on the board to recapture the data corresponding to the lost image data. (Page 14, lines 5-10.)

Neither Magro nor Wasserman recognize this problem, nor do they provide any motivation to combine their teachings to obtain the claimed system, as recited in claim 11.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn and the claims allowed. Should any other action be contemplated by the Examiner, it is respectfully requested that he contact the undersigned at (408) 392-9250 to discuss the application.

In the unlikely event that the transmittal letter is separated from this document and the Patent Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, Applicants petition for any required relief including extensions of time and authorize the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or fees due in connection with this document to Deposit Account No. 50-2257 referencing docket no. M-15703 US.

**EXPRESS MAIL LABEL NO.
EV 534 474 984 US**

Respectfully submitted,



Hugh H. Matsubayashi
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 43,779